

Teaching pre-service teachers to design inclusive instruction: a lesson planning template

Julie N. Causton-Theoharis^{a*}, George T. Theoharis^a and
Beverly J. Trezek^b

^a*Department of Teaching and Leadership, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, USA;*

^b*DePaul University, Chicago, IL, USA*

When designing lessons to meet the needs of our increasingly diverse population of students, educators need to rethink planning and structuring lessons so that all students achieve better results. Therefore, teacher preparation programmes need to prepare pre-service teachers accordingly. Within this paper, a new lesson planning template is unveiled that builds on many of the foundational concepts of inclusive education. This template is meant for teacher educators to use with pre-service teachers across the curriculum to guide the design of inclusive lessons. This paper discusses the foundations, unique features, and applications of this student-centred lesson design template to create creative and active learning for students in inclusive classrooms.

Introduction

Teachers today are met with an increasingly diverse population of students. Presently, our public school classrooms contain students from a much wider array of ability/disability, racial and linguistic backgrounds than the classrooms of the past. In the USA there are 5.5 million students with special needs and nearly half of them are now educated in the general education classroom for more than 79% of the school day (US Department of Education, 2005). The percentage of students of colour in public schools in the USA has also grown considerably over the past 30 years. In 1972, 22% of public school students were considered to be part of a racial or ethnic minority group, while in 2003, this number rose to 42% (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2005c). The percentage of English language learners has also grown from 9% of all students in 1979 to 19% in 2003. It has also been reported that the number

*Corresponding author: Department of Teaching and Leadership, Syracuse University, 150 Huntington Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244, USA. Email: jcauston@syr.edu

of students who speak a language other than English at home has increased by 161% over that past 30 years (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2005b). As we move toward more inclusive schools, increasing numbers of students of all abilities and backgrounds are being educated in the general education classroom (US Department of Education, 2005). This change has enriched our public schools because it creates opportunities for students truly to understand and value differences and similarities as children from a multitude of backgrounds, cultures and abilities learn alongside one another.

This new classroom diversity is interestingly juxtaposed with new political pressures and a focus on accountability. When high-stakes tests and teacher accountability are at the centre of our educational rhetoric, there are immense demands placed on teachers to increase students' scores on standardized tests. Specifically, with the passing of No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, schools are required to test every student and demonstrate annual yearly progress. A lack of annual yearly progress can result in serious sanctions for schools and districts (United States Congress, 2002). The stresses of No Child Left Behind have been exacerbated by national and statewide discussions and policies linking teachers' salaries and merit increases to student performance on these tests (Archer, 2000; Bradley, 2000; Slotnik, 2005). These demands directly affect teachers and the manner in which they approach instruction.

Unfortunately, these pressures and the increased diversity of students have tended to create classrooms of our past, where rote learning and memorization have returned as the primary means of educating students. Standardized test preparation is often given priority over content-rich units of study. Teachers report moving away from constructivist lesson design to more teacher-directed traditional instruction and abandon their efforts toward student-centred pedagogy (Ascher, 1990; Passman, 2000). Although we recognize the potential benefit of teacher-directed instruction and the need to strike a balance between it and student-centred pedagogy, we are also aware that some of these methods and the traditional education system have failed certain populations of students for decades. Without significantly changing the way we think about students and learning, we fear that this cycle of failure is likely to continue.

Nationally, there are alarming statistics about children in our schools, particularly for students who have been and continue to be marginalized. The National Center for Educational Statistics (2005e, f) reported that only 36% of 17-year-olds are at or above grade level for reading and 58% in mathematics. Fewer than one-third of black or Hispanic 17-year-old students are at grade level in mathematics and fewer than one-quarter of these students are at or above grade level in reading. Roughly, only 85% of students in the USA reportedly completed high school in 2002, suggesting that 3.7 million school-aged students were considered 'drop outs' (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2005a). According to the most recently available statistics, a disproportionate number of Black and Latino students drop out of school (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2005d). Interestingly, these numbers are not drastically different from those reported 30 years ago, meaning that our educational

system consistently under-serves certain populations of students. If educators continue to plan and teach in the same manner, we will continue to get the same results.

This paper will begin by exploring how alternative means of teaching lesson plan design in teacher preparation programmes can more accurately align current educational theories to practical applications within inclusive classrooms. The justification for and unique features of the proposed lesson template will also be supplied. A discussion of the impact of this change in pre-service lesson planning preparation and directions for future research will also be explored.

Linking theory to practice

Now more than ever, we as teacher educators need to be the catalyst for creating more than just schools for all children. Teaching pre-service teachers to anticipate and prepare for diverse populations of students in inclusive settings happens in many ways. For many of us in teacher preparation, this has become the focus of our courses and programmes. We teach lessons at the University on recognizing students' strengths, multiple intelligence (Gardner, 1999) theory, differentiation, constructivist approaches to teaching, and culturally relevant pedagogy to name a few. These practices should indeed continue. We then arrive at that magical point in teacher preparation programme, usually before student teaching or practicum experiences, when we teach students how to plan lessons.

Teaching lesson planning or lesson design is a pivotal moment in teacher education. It is at this point when we are, in essence, teaching future educators how to think about the relationship between educational theories, lesson planning, instructional strategies, students and learning. It is at this point when theory intersects with practice. This is the time to teach these pre-service teachers how to place students at the centre of the planning process. Pre-service teachers need to know how to prepare for differences in abilities and experiences in each and every lesson and differentiation needs to be central in planning, rather than an after-thought.

While the literature suggests that lesson planning can be considered the rehearsal for delivering effective instruction, many in teacher preparation continue to use the traditional models of lesson design relying heavily on Hunter's (1982) model which includes: (1) objectives; (2) standards; (3) anticipatory set; (4) teaching (input, modelling, and check for understanding); (5) guided practice; (6) closure; and (7) independent practice (Mollica, 1994; Boudah *et al.*, 1997; Skowron, 2001; Chatel, 2002). Although Hunter's method gives insight about how to structure a lesson, it omits guidance around individual students, needs and strengths, behaviour management, student support, etc. Without re-examining our lesson planning designs, we are not training our teachers to plan for all of the students who will be coming through the classroom door. Only when teacher education as a field changes the way we teach the core concepts of lesson planning can our future teachers be agents of change, improving education for all students, in particular those students on the margins.

Proposed lesson planning template

The following lesson planning template was designed for use with pre-service teachers in an inclusive teacher education programme in central New York. The college students who are being taught to utilize this template will receive dual certification in general education and special education in an Inclusive Elementary teacher preparation programme. This template has been introduced to these students during their junior and senior years in the curricular areas of mathematics, science, social studies, and in a course on academic accommodations. In addition, students have employed this template to design instruction during extended practicum experiences before their student teaching semester and again during their student teaching. This template, which builds on the literature suggesting that there is a direct connection between lesson planning and effective instruction (Lambert, 1988), is further described in the following sections.

Foundations of inclusive lesson design

This lesson-planning template was built upon the foundational concepts of Universal Design, Multiple Intelligence Theory (Gardner, 1999), Culturally Responsive Teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995), and Curricular Adaptations (Udvari-Solner, 1995, 1996). Each of these concepts has influenced the construction or flow of the end-product. The strengths of some more traditional forms of lesson planning such as Hunter (1982), Mager (1984) and Bloom (1956) are utilized to create a format for the lesson-planning template.

This lesson-planning template is the result of four semesters of planning and revision. Designing this template began with combining the theory of universal design (Danielson, 1999; Bowe, 2000) and curricular adaptation (Udvari-Solner, 1995, 1996) with Hunter's traditional lesson planning format. Combining these two theories resulted in a hybrid lesson planning process with key aspects from the fields of special education and teacher education. However, this process did not adequately address strategies to teach pre-service teachers to include and respond to diverse needs. Therefore, the next steps in creating the template included weaving in multiple intelligence theory (Gardner, 1999) as a way for students to conceptualize student strengths, lesson products, and the learning process. At this stage, the emerging template was not consistent with Ladson-Billings's (1994) description of culturally responsive teaching. The template was then re-examined with a lens for creating culturally responsive classrooms and experiences (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995). At this stage, the product lacked specific ways for pre-service teachers to structure their objectives and a framework for how to view children's thinking and challenge students individually. Thus, Mager's (1984) structure for objectives and Bloom's (1956) *Taxonomy* were reviewed and incorporated into the lesson-planning template.

Before the template was utilized with pre-service teachers, university faculty across the fields of special education, mathematics education, science education, social studies education and educational leadership in the inclusive teacher education

programme in central New York reviewed it and provided feedback. It was at this point the template began being used to help scaffold pre-service teacher planning. Over the next three semesters, pre-service teachers, university field supervisors, public school teachers, and university faculty have met to critique and improve the template that will be introduced here.

Introducing the lesson planning template

This lesson-planning template is designed to scaffold the thinking, skills and attitudes of pre-service teachers. The ultimate goal is that this process of lesson planning will become automatic as these new teachers approach lesson design. For years, it has been documented in the literature that the lesson planning model teachers learn in their methods courses are altered and simplified when they become certified teachers (Koeller & Thompson, 1980), but the general framework and thought process remain. In order to understand the thought process of the pre-service teacher, a great amount of detail is documented in the template as evidence of their thinking. We realize that when these students are designing lessons as certified teachers, their written plans will not include as much detail; however, this type of preparation will give them the skills to engage in a similar, albeit abbreviated, process.

The proposed template (see the Appendix) includes six sections specifically created to guide pre-service teachers through the process of designing inclusive lessons. The sections include: (1) lesson context, (2) lesson content, (3) lesson process, (4) lesson product, (5) lesson outline, and (6) reflection. As a point of clarification, from this point on, the term 'teacher' will be used in this paper to refer to pre-service teachers and 'student' to refer to the students with whom these teachers are working.

Unique features of lesson design template

Lesson context

It is essential in student-centred design to begin lesson planning by considering the larger curricular picture in combination with the essence of the learners. The first section of the template, entitled lesson context, requires the teachers to think about the larger contextual positioning of the lesson. At this point, the teachers focus on who the students are, how this lesson fits into the larger sequence of lessons and the background knowledge students have on the topic. The feature of this section of the lesson design template that is particularly distinct when compared to other lesson planning models is the selection of three target students. This selection is positioned at the beginning of the lesson allowing teachers to think about each of the students in the class and consider which students will require more careful consideration as the lesson is being designed.

The teachers are encouraged to consider students with disabilities, English language learning needs, behavioural challenges, or other unique learning styles or characteristics and choose three students that represent the diversity of the class. Considering

these students and their strengths and backgrounds at the beginning of the lesson supports best practices in Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995), Curricular Adaptations (Udvari-Solner, 1995, 1996), and Universal Design of Curriculum (Danielson, 1999; Bowe, 2000). When teachers determine which students they will use for their target students, they then write a positive and professional student profile for each of the three selected students. The rationale for having teachers write a profile on each of the target students is to encourage them to think further about the strengths and unique characteristics these learners bring to the lesson.

Lesson content

In this current standards-based era, it is expected that teachers write goals for a lesson that are connected to national, state, and local standards. The second section of the template, lesson content, begins with these goals and standards. The next step for teachers is to think through the content and create meaningful objectives for all students in the class. On the quest to challenge and meet the needs of all students, teachers consider if the content will differ for any of the target students. Using the concept of Universal Design, teachers are taught to consider each learner and their needs at the beginning of lesson design, instead of retrofitting the lesson to the learners once it has been designed. The teachers then create objectives for the entire class as well as any student specific objectives that are necessary. These student specific objectives may be based on Individual Education Program (IEP) goals, academic needs, social needs, language needs or other student specific needs.

Lesson product

For the third section of the lesson template, teachers are required to consider how students can demonstrate their learning. This demonstration or product needs to link specifically to the lesson objectives outlined at the beginning of the template. Each of Gardner's (1999) Multiple Intelligences is used to spark creative and innovative ways for students to demonstrate their new knowledge. These teachers are required to brainstorm and write one idea for each of the intelligences (i.e. assessing multiplication using a bodily kinesthetic approach). They are also specifically asked to consider using authentic assessments whenever possible (e.g. portfolios, demonstrations, anecdotal records, rubrics).

Lesson process

The fourth section of this template requires that the teachers think creatively about the lesson process and how to differentiate the process to meet individual student needs. They are to consider how the students will engage in learning and how they as teachers will present information. Again, we suggest that teachers consider Gardner's (1999) eight intelligences to determine innovative and creative ways of having students access the content. This framework allows the teachers to think through active learning

activities and strategies aligned with each intelligence instead of simply relying on traditional methods of instruction. Another unique feature of this section is that the teachers consider the systems of support and supervision during planning. Keeping student independence and support in mind, this component of the template focuses planning on effectively utilizing all adults (e.g. classroom teacher, aide, etc.) in the class.

Lesson outline

The traditional lesson sequence is positioned in the fifth section of the template. It is here where teachers write the introduction, body, and conclusion of the lesson. Teachers are asked to gain students' attention with a motivating introduction, to consider Bloom's *Taxonomy* when formulating questions to ask students. Another major component of this section of the lesson-planning template is for teachers to ensure high expectations for each student. They are encouraged to structure and sequence their lesson to move each learner to a new level of understanding. Lastly, they are expected to close their lessons by having students organize their own learning. It has been well documented in the literature that lesson planning and classroom management are linked (MacLennan, 1987; Dawson, 2002). Expanding upon the traditional lesson sequence, within the lesson outline section of our template, teachers are specifically taught to think about behavioural considerations of the students and the assistive technologies that can be utilized during the lesson to aid individual students.

Reflection

Given that self-observation is important to help teachers' understand themselves and their own educational process (Hart *et al.*, 1992; Howard, 2003), after the lesson is written and the teachers have finished teaching, they are then expected to reflect upon their design and preparation. They also reflect upon student engagement and student learning. Teachers are taught to focus particular attention on the learning of the target students and are required to provide documentation to illustrate what students have learned. Teachers think and write about their own learning and document any educational theories that guided their thinking. The purpose of this reflection is to allow students to think through the entire design and implementation process and investigate their own learning, strengths and challenges.

To date, approximately 120 pre-service teachers have learned how to plan lessons using this template. We are currently in the process of formally studying the use and effectiveness of this template. However, initial feedback and informal data have yielded quite positive results from a variety of stakeholders. First, a number of supervising teachers and graduate students who are in the field observing these lessons have expressed that when they are observing students' lessons, it is evident that they are thinking more about all students in their class. Our own observations of student's lessons reveal more detailed planning which seemingly is resulting in a more complex understanding of differentiation and constructivist approaches to teaching and learning.

Additionally, we have collected informal data regarding the lesson-planning template in the form of an end of the semester course and assignment evaluations. What follows is a summary of student themes about the template both before and after implementing it in a classroom setting. Prior to implementation, the vast majority of pre-service teachers who used the template were 'overwhelmed' by the scope and expectations. One pre-service teacher reported, 'I could not believe all that we were expected to do for our lessons. We had never been asked to do this much planning before'. In addition, many pre-service teachers were frustrated with the amount of work this template entailed. 'This template is too much work.' However, after utilizing the template and experiencing the resulting lesson, the perceptions of the students were altered. For example, the majority of the pre-service teachers reported that using the template, 'profoundly changed the way I think about planning and teaching'. One student stated, 'This template has been the single most powerful part of my teacher preparation. I finally understand what it means and what it takes to plan for all students'. A formal assessment of students' perceptions of this template and its affects on student learning certainly warrants further investigation.

Implications for practice and research

The implications for teaching lesson planning in new and different ways are clear. If we can change the ways that perspective teachers think about teaching and learning, we can change the ways future students receive an education. Most notably, by placing certain students at the front of lesson design as opposed to as an afterthought, we can have real effects for those students. Many of the core elements of the lesson planning template are present in some lesson planning formats, but the juxtaposition of each of the sections, the unique order and attention to traditionally marginalized students is what makes our template so unique.

Future research may focus on the effects and efficacy of this template on the learning outcomes for all students. It would also be interesting to interview pre-service teachers to determine if this tool altered their thinking about individual students and curriculum and instruction in general. Conducting a component analysis on the template might be useful in helping to determine which components are most effective in helping pre-service teachers plan for all students. Lastly, it would be important to create a condensed version of the template for students who have used the template for teaching several lessons. It would be our hope that their thinking about lesson planning would become more automatic and thus the level of detail included in the original template would be unnecessary.

Conclusions

As our schools are becoming increasingly diverse, we are seeing more students with a range of abilities in the context of the general education classroom. This new diversity serves as an excellent opportunity for us as educators to move beyond the classrooms of our past, where students who have been marginalized are falling far behind

their peers academically, and into the classrooms of today where the needs of all students are being considered. We can create learning opportunities that engage all students—by design.

This lesson design template alone will not change the face of education, but until we effectively teach pre-service teachers to engage traditionally marginalized students in different ways and design lessons with all students in mind, we will maintain the inequitable status quo for these children. Careful and thoughtful design is not the same as skilled instruction; however, universally designed lessons are an important first step in providing thoughtful inclusive instruction.

This template combines best practices in inclusive education and is designed for use in teacher preparation programmes across the content areas (e.g. music education, social studies, mathematics, sciences, languages, arts, etc.). In all content areas, pre-service teachers need to prepare lessons with both students and content in mind. As teacher educators, our job is to prepare future teachers not only to expect, welcome and embrace the wide array of students that will soon enter their classrooms, but also to prepare them to plan for and teach these students effectively so that each student can reach their full, and well-deserved, academic potential.

Notes on contributors

- Dr. Julie Causton-Theoharis is an Assistant Professor in the Inclusive and Special Education Program in the Department of Teaching and Leadership at Syracuse University. Her teaching and research focus on inclusive education, differentiation, paraprofessionals and social interaction for students in inclusive classrooms.
- Dr. George Theoharis is an Assistant Professor in Educational Leadership and Inclusive Education in the Department of Teaching and Leadership at Syracuse University. His teaching and research focus on leadership for social justice, inclusive schooling and creating equitable schools for marginalized students.
- Dr. Beverly Trezek is an Assistant Professor in Language, Literacy and Specialized Instruction in the School of Education at DePaul University. Her teaching and research focus on effective reading instruction for special populations, visual phonics, Direct Instruction and improving academic outcomes for students who are deaf or hard of hearing.

References

- Archer, J. (2000) Denver pay-for-performance pilot still has far to go, report says, *Education Week*, 12 July, 42.
- Ascher, C. (1990) *Can Performance-based Assessments Improve Urban Schooling?* ERIC Digest No. 56 (New York, NY, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education).
- Bloom, B. S. (1956) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain* (New York, NY, David McKay).
- Boudah, D., Deshler, D., Schumaker, J., Lenz, K. & Cook, B. (1997) Student centered or content-centered? A case study of a middle school teacher's lesson planning and instruction in inclusive classes, *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 20(3), 189–203.

- Bowe, F. G. (2000) *Universal Design in Education: Teaching Non-traditional Students* (Westport, CT, Bergen & Garvey).
- Bradley, A. (2000) L. A. proposes linking teacher pay to tests, *Education Week*, 22 March, 28.
- Chatel, R. G. (2002) *Lesson Planning & Analysis: Including Analysis of Implementation & Samples of Student Work*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED459469 (Bloomington, US Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement).
- Danielson, L. (1999) Universal design: ensuring access to the general education curriculum, *Research Connections*, 5, 2–3.
- Dawson, K. (2002) Best discipline is good curriculum, *Rethinking Schools*, 17(1), 34–35.
- Gardner, H. (1999) *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligence for the 21st Century* (New York, NY, Basic).
- Hart, L. C., Schultz, K., Najee-ullah, D. & Nash, L. (1992) The role of reflection in teaching, *Arithmetic Teaching*, 39(10), 40–42.
- Howard, T. C. (2003) Culturally relevant pedagogy: ingredients for critical teacher reflection, *Theory into Practice*, 42(3), 195–202.
- Hunter, M. (1982) *Mastery Teaching: Increasing Instructional Effectiveness in Elementary and Secondary Schools, Colleges, and Universities* (Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin).
- Koeller, S. & Thompson, E. (1980) Another look at lesson planning, *Educational Leadership*, 37(8), 673–675.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994) *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African-American Children* (San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass).
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995) But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy, *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 159–165.
- Lambert, G. E. (1988) Lesson planning and the experienced teacher, *OCSS Review*, 24(1), 52–58.
- MacLennan, S. (1987) Integrating lesson planning and class management, *ELT Journal*, 41(3), 193–197.
- Mager, R. F. (1984) *Preparing Instructional Objectives* (2nd edn) (Belmont, CA, David S. Lake).
- Mollica, A. (1994) Planning for successful teaching: the lesson outline, *Mosaic*, 1(3), 13–15.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2005a) *Educational Attainment*. Available online at: <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2005/section3/indicator23.asp> (accessed 5 October 2005).
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2005b) *Language Minority School-Age Children*. Available online at: <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2005/section1/indicator05.asp> (accessed 5 October 2005).
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2005c) Racial/ethnic distribution of public school students. Available online at: <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2005/section1/indicator04.asp> (accessed 5 October 2005).
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2005d) *Status Dropout Rates by Race/Ethnicity*. Available online at: <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2005/section3/indicator19.asp> (accessed 5 October 2005).
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2005e) *2004 Long-term Trend Reading, Percentage At or Above Each Performance Level by Student Group, Age 17: Selected Years, 1971–2004*. Available online at: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/ltt/results2004/age_17_reading_perf_perf.asp (accessed 5 October 2005).
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2005f) *2004 Long-term Trend Mathematics, Percentage At or Above Each Performance Level by Student Group, Age 17: Selected Years, 1978–2004*. Available online at: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/ltt/results2004/age_17_math_perf.asp (accessed 5 October 2005).
- Passman, R. (2000) Pressure cooker: experiences with students centered teaching and learning in high stakes assessment environments. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, 27–29 January 2000, Dallas, TX, USA.
- Skowron, J. (2001) *Powerful Lesson Planning Models: The Art of 1,000 Decisions* (Arlington Heights, IL, Skylight Professional Development).

- Slotnik, W. J. (2005) Mission possible: tying earning to learning, *Education Week*, 28 September, 40, 32.
- Udvari-Solner, A. (1995) A process for adapting curriculum in inclusive classrooms, in: R. Villa & J. Thousand (Eds) *Creating an Inclusive School* (Baltimore, MD, Paul R. Brookes), 110-124.
- Udvari-Solner, A. (1996) Examining teaching thinking: constructing a process to design curricular adaptation, *Remedial and Special Education*, 17, 245-254.
- United States Congress (2002) *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Public Law 107-110*. Available online at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf> (accessed 5 October 2005).
- U.S. Department of Education (2005) To ensure the free appropriate public education of all children with learning difficulties. Twenty-sixth annual report to congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2004 (Washington D.C.: Author).

Appendix: Inclusive lesson planning template

This lesson-planning template is designed to help you develop skills and attitudes about thoughtful, inclusive lesson design. Therefore, we expect a great amount of detail as evidence of your thinking. Please understand, when you are designing lessons as a certified teacher, your written plans will not include as much detail, however you will engage in a similar, albeit abbreviated, process. In a separate document include your thoughtful response to the following lesson planning components.

Section 1 — Lesson Context

A. Description of Grade Level/School

B. Description of Your Class:

Demographics, unique characteristics, etc.

C. Subject or Discipline(s):

What is the primary discipline (e.g. social studies) and the area(s) of emphasis (e.g. geography)? Is this lesson interdisciplinary? If so, what other disciplines are integrated (e.g. music)?

D. Central Theme, Concept, Problem, or Unit:

Include a rationale for your choice of topic (i.e. Why did you select this topic?)

E. Instructors:

Include all adults who will be present during the lesson.

F. Duration of the Lesson:

How long will this lesson take?

G. Background of the Lesson:

Describe where this lesson fits into the larger picture. What has come before this lesson and what will follow?

How does this lesson connect to the larger unit?

H. Student Background Knowledge:

What do students know about this topic? How have you/will you gather info on students' background knowledge? You must collect this information *before* you teach your lesson for each student. How has their prior knowledge informed your lesson planning?

- *Consider: Using a KWL, formal or informal assessment data, a quiz, anecdotal information from other teachers, etc.*

I. Target Students:

Select three students to keep in mind during this lesson designing process. These students should represent an academic, behavioural and/or social range of learners in your class (e.g. struggling, average, high performing). At least one of these students should have a disability. Also consider behavioural challenges, English language learners, or other traditionally marginalized learners. Use initials to ensure confidentiality.

Write a positive student profile for each of the students, at minimum you must include the following information: (1) background, (2) like/dislikes, (3) intelligences, (4) strengths, (5) communication, (6) behaviour, (7) academic performance, (8) social information, (9) concerns, and (10) other pertinent information.

Section 2 — Lesson Content

A. Lesson Standards:

What grade level-specific national and state standard(s) are being addressed (district standards are optional)? Include key ideas, performance indicators, specific expectations, major understandings, and process skills as appropriate.

B. Lesson Goal:

What do you want students to know and be able to do by the end of this lesson? Consider the big picture. What is the mathematical (or scientific, or social studies, etc.) purpose of this lesson?

C. Content Differentiation:

How can I challenge all students?

- *Consider: Do any students already know this content? Will any students be bored? Do any students need to have a functional application relating to this content? What background knowledge do students need to access this content? Do I need to make this more concrete for some students?*

D. Whole-class, Multi-level Lesson Objectives :

Specifically, in measurable language, what do you want students to know and be able to do by the end of this lesson?

- Clearly write whole class objectives using the Mager format (Condition, Performance and Criteria).
- *Consider: Knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, values, communication, motoric, interpersonal or behavioural objectives etc.*
- For mathematics: Refer to Horizon protocol, p. 5, and criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9.

E. Student-Specific Objectives:

Write any specific objectives (using the Mager format) for individual students.

- Consider: The student's profile, educational priorities and critical IEP goals to justify your decisions.
- For EED 333/623 address what specific mathematics is being learned.

F. Definitions of Targeted Terms

List the targeted terms or content specific words and the corresponding definitions you expect students to learn during the lesson. Definitions should be grade-level appropriate.

Section 3 — Lesson Product

How the students demonstrate their learning? These should tie specifically to the lesson objectives.

A. Product Differentiation:

In what varied ways can students demonstrate their learning?

Use the following matrix to **brainstorm** different student products using each of the intelligences. Use the list you generate to help determine which way(s) students will demonstrate learning.

Intelligence	Possible products
Linguistic	
Logical/mathematical	
Spatial	
Bodily kinesthetic	
Musical	
Interpersonal	
Intrapersonal	
Naturalistic	

B. Authentic Assessment:

In what authentic ways will students demonstrate new knowledge, growth or understanding? How will you measure what they learned?

- Consider: Work samples, song, play, photo essay, mural, article, demonstration of a skill, booklet, individual or group presentation, videotape, CD, teaching another person, pageant interview, etc.
- Consider: Will these products vary by student? Will students have a choice? Will different levels of mastery be accepted? How will these products be assessed? What criteria will be used? Will you use a rubric? If so, include it.

Section 4 — Lesson Process

How will you share information? How will the students engage in the learning?

A. Process Differentiation:

How can I teach in ways that will reach all students?

Use the following matrix to **brainstorm** different processes of teaching using each of the intelligences. Use the list you generate to help determine which way(s) you plan to teach the lesson.

Intelligence	Possible processes
Linguistic	
Logical/mathematical	
Spatial	
Bodily kinesthetic	
Musical	
Interpersonal	
Intrapersonal	
Naturalistic	

B. Lesson Formats:

How will students take part in the lesson?

- Consider: Demonstrations, experiential learning, group investigation, games, simulations, centres, student led, multi-media, presentation, mini-lecture, peer dialogues, etc.

C. Room Arrangement:

How will the physical arrangement of the room, social rules, or norms be configured for the lesson to ensure student success?

- Consider: Light, sound, physical access, another part of the building, in the community, rules, expectations, noise level, background music, etc.

D. Student Arrangement:

How will students be grouped during this lesson?

- Consider: Small groups, cooperative partnerships, cross-age pairings, active learning strategies, etc.

E. General Teaching Strategies :

What teaching strategies will be used to help the students learn? Will you use specific questioning techniques, pacing, prompting or cueing?

- Consider: *Think-pair-share, graffiti, talk-walk, call and response, question-all write, etc.*
- What specific questions will you ask the students?

F. Student Specific Teaching Strategies:

Will there be any variation of teaching strategies, or specific strategies used that will be particularly useful for specific students?

- Consider: *Pre-teaching, foreshadowing, adjust pacing, sequence, repetition of key points or directions, periodically check performance, reduce or increase complexity, functional applications, physical guidance, pair verbal instruction with other modes of input, adjust behaviour management.*

G. Systems of Support and Supervision:

What are the specific configurations of adults during this lesson? Share this information with each of the adults who will be present during this lesson. *Give all adults present a specific role.*

- Consider: *Options for co-teaching: One teach-one support, station teaching, one teach-one model, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, one teach-one make the presentation multi-sensory, split class with same content, team-teaching, tag-team teaching, etc.*
- Consider: *Will any student require more support or supervision during this lesson? What type of natural or peer support will be provided? Does any adult or peer in this class need information about how to support anyone during this lesson? If a peer provides support, how will they be trained? How will you ensure that this partnership will benefit both partners academically? If additional adult support is used, how will this support be given in a way that promotes independence and choice? How will the support be faded?*

Section 5 — Lesson outline

What specifically will you do during your lesson?

A. Sequence of Lesson:

- Consider: *The Learning Cycle: Engage, Explore, Explain, Apply.*
- Consider: *Hunter's sequence here. Teaching: Input, Modelling and Checking for Understanding, Guided Practice and Independent Practice.*
- Consider: *The Launch, the Exploration/Investigation, and the Discussion/Congress.*

B. Behavioural Considerations:

What behavioural strategies will you use to keep all students engaged? Do you anticipate that any students will exhibit challenging behaviour during this lesson? What positive behavioural supports will you put in place? Will you need/is there a 'crisis'

plan in place? Make sure in your lesson body (below) to review your behavioural expectations.

- *Consider: Setting expectations, praising desired behaviour, purposeful partnering, increasing student responsibility, individual behaviour plan, more or different type of support, choice, proximity, scheduled breaks, voicetone, incentives, etc.*

C. Introduction (Anticipatory set, The Hook or Launch):

How will you grab the student's attention? How will you put them in a receptive frame of mind for learning?

The introduction needs to be included in the lesson body (the chart). This should be creative and interesting.

D. Body:

This is the core of the lesson. In this section number and list the sequence of steps you will follow as you implement the lesson. Use the following format.

- Clock time: Write the actual time each segment will occur.
- Sequence of steps: Write in detail each step that will occur during your lesson:
 - Make sure you write or draw an agenda for your lesson and review it with the students. (Include in lesson body.)
 - Make sure you post (write or draw) and review your objective(s) in an age-appropriate manner. (Include in lesson body.)
 - Make sure in your lesson body to review your behavioural expectations.
 - Label where each phase of the learning cycle or other lesson sequence begins
 - (Engage, Explore ... or launch, exploration)
 - Be sure to include when and how assessment takes place in the body of your lesson.
- Include both your intro and closure in the lesson body.
- Questions: Write questions you are prepared to ask the students. Use Bloom's *Taxonomy*.
- Adaptations: Write any specific adaptations that are needed for the corresponding step of the lesson.
- Anticipated Student Response: Write what you expect students' reaction will be to the content, not management or attitudinal responses.
- Notes: Leave this space blank initially. During your lesson, have your teacher take notes and give your feedback here. Following your lesson, you add your notes in a different colour.

E. Closure (Summary):

This is done at the end of the lesson. The purpose of the closure is to help students organize their learning, to reinforce major points to clarify any confusion:

Clock time	Sequence of steps	Questions	Adaptations	Anticipated student response	Notes
9:10–9:25	(1) Read: 'We are alike, we are different'	What makes the child in the book feel different? How are you like someone in this class?	Sam requires his own copy of book due to visual impairment	Student words and/or reaction to the content, not management or attitudinal responses	Leave this space blank. During your lesson, your S.T. will write here
9:25–9:35	(2) Model body tracing/cutting	After modelling: what do you need to do first?, etc.	Have Damon help trace teacher to keep engaged		After the lesson, you will add your own notes in a different colour ink from the S.T.

- How will you bring the lesson to a conclusion?
- How will you help students to make sense of what they just learned?
- How will you transition to the next step?

The closure needs to be included in the lesson sequence (the chart). This should be creative and interesting.

F. Materials and Assistive Technologies:

- Describe and list the multi-sensory materials that will be used during your lesson.
- Include numbers of each material that is needed and how many are needed for each group (i.e. 12 timers; or each group will receive one thermometer, two sponges, three containers of hot water).
- Describe any unique material considerations for specific students.
- Are there any types of assistive technology (high or low tech) that will be useful for any student to help them to do a particular step in this lesson?
- Make sure all materials look professional (i.e. worksheets must be computer generated).
- *Consider: Access to written material, communication, the physical space etc.*

G. Advanced Preparation Reminders:

What do you need to take care of before the lesson? (e.g. make play-dough for dough maps). List these to help you organize yourself before the lesson. Make sure you write or draw an agenda for your lesson and review it with the students before starting your lesson.

Section 6 — Reflection

A. After Teaching the Lesson Reflect on the Following:

- Student learning (whole class and three target students). Be sure to include evidence that students have learned something. The student's voices should come out in your reflection.
- Student engagement and participation (whole class and three target students).
- Your planning, preparation and teaching.
- What you learned from this lesson and changes you would make for next time.
- Collaboration/Co-teaching (if applicable).
- Educational theories that guided your decision making.
- Use of student data for planning or adapting this lesson.
- Use of technology (if applicable).
- Your host teacher's comments.